

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, 38-50, and 52-59 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 30, 44, and 59 are independent. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, and 52-59 were rejected. Applicants amend claims 1, 30, and 44, and 59 herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to claim 56 (Office Action at page 24).

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action at page 2, third paragraph, claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, 30-33, 36, 42-47, 50, and 56-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0001896 to Johnson (hereafter “Johnson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A. Claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, and 56

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A computer readable storage medium storing computer executable instructions that when executed on a processor manage a graphical interface, the medium storing:

instructions for providing a graphical interface, a hardware device and a software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the software device being accessible to a computer;

instructions for providing at least one interactive hardware object accessible to the computer, where the hardware object represents the hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, the hardware object interacting with the hardware device;

instructions for providing a software object, wherein the software object is representative of the software device, where the software object is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device;

instructions for receiving, from a user, a plurality of configurations of the hardware device, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object;

instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device;

instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations; and

instructions for communicating with the hardware device corresponding to the selected configuration using the selected configuration.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson fails to disclose at least *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, Johnson does not allow a user to select (at most) a single configuration from among the plurality of configurations for communicating with the hardware device.

Johnson is generally directed to a system for specifying measurement tasks. In specifying a measurement task, a user may set properties for, for example, a number of channels used by the device (Johnson at Figure 26). The user specifies information about the channels, and then each of the channels are used in the measurement task.

In contrast, claim 1 recites *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*. Claim 1 allows a user to specify a plurality of potential configurations for a hardware device, and select a single configuration from among the plurality of configurations for communicating with the device (Specification at page 5).

The Examiner interprets each channel of Johnson as a “configuration” of the hardware device (Advisory Action at page 2, lines 5-6). The Examiner states that “a ‘configuration’ can be read as a single setting of a hardware device, each hardware device requiring a plurality of configurations to be set in order to operate” (Advisory Action at page 2, lines 11-12).

In order to clarify the distinction between the claimed medium and the Examiner’s interpretation of the cited reference, Applicants amend claim 1 to recite that a user selects one configuration from the plurality of configurations (see, e.g., Specification at page 5). Johnson does not disclose this feature of claim 1 because under the Examiner’s interpretation of Johnson, each hardware device “requires a plurality of configurations to be set in order to operate” (Advisory Action at page 2, lines 11-12).

For at least the reasons identified above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

B. Claims 30-33, 36, 42-43, and 57

Independent claim 30 recites:

30. A method for managing an interface, the method comprising:
providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment, a hardware device and a software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the software device being accessible to a computer;

providing at least one hardware object accessible to the computer, where the hardware object represents the hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, the hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;

providing at least one software object, representative of the software device, where the software object is depicted in the graphical interface, and is configured to be interactive with the software device and;

updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment; and
displaying the hardware object and the software object to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment* nor *updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment* which are present in claim 30.

The Examiner asserts that claim 30 is directed to “the actual use of measurement devices.” Therefore, the Examiner argues that the updating of a display during a measurement task, as is done in Johnson, reads on claim 30.

However, claim 30 does not recite the actual use of a measurement device. As described, for example, in the Specification at page 24, the changes reflected on the graphical interface may include, for example, disconnecting a hardware device from an array based environment (e.g., a MATLAB environment). In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claim 30 to recite *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment* and *updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment.*

Johnson is silent as to a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment. The Examiner states that “in Johnson, when the measurement device is configured and in use, it monitors conditions at the measurement device and updates the graphical interface to alert users of the changes in the device” (Advisory Action at page 2, 3rd paragraph). Accordingly, under the Examiner’s interpretation, the graphical interface in Johnson is updated in response to a physical change in the measurement device, and not a change in the hardware or software object in the array-based environment.

For at least the reasons stated above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 depend from independent claim 30 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 30. Accordingly claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, 57 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

C. Claims 44-47, 50, and 58

Independent claim 44 recites:

44. A computing device comprising:
an array-based environment;
a storage medium for storing and a processor for processing;
a graphical interface, at least one hardware device and one software device
being accessible through the graphical interface;

a plurality of hardware objects accessible to the computer, where each of the hardware objects represents a hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, each hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;

a plurality of software objects, each representative of a software device accessible to the computer, where each of the software objects is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device; and

a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously, *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface.*

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface*, which is present in claim 44.

The Specification at page 24 describes how a user may interact with the hardware object, the software object, or an analysis object through either the array based environment or the graphical interface. This allows a user, for example, to make a change to an underlying hardware, software, or analysis object in an array-based environment (such as MATLAB) and have the change reflected in the graphical interface.

Johnson does not disclose interaction through an array-based environment. In Johnson, the GUI is “for guiding the user in specifying a measurement task” (Johnson at paragraph [0125]). Indeed, Johnson teaches at paragraphs [0009]-[0010] that it is desirable for users to interact with a GUI instead of through some other interface (such as an array-based environment). Johnson teaches that the use of a non-GUI-based interface requires users to “specify and configure measurement tasks at an advanced level, which is time consuming, expensive, and prone to error” (Johnson at paragraph [0009]). Accordingly, Johnson teaches away from allowing the objects to be accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface, which is present in claim 44.

For at least the reasons stated above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 45-47, 50, and 58 depend from independent claim 44 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 44. Accordingly claims 45-47, 50, and 58 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 44. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 45-47, 50, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

D. Claim 59

Independent claim 59 recites:

59. A computer readable storage medium storing computer executable instructions that when executed on a processor manage a graphical interface, the medium storing:

instructions for providing a graphical interface, at least one hardware device and one software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware device or the software device;

instructions for providing a plurality of hardware objects accessible to the computer, where each of the hardware objects represents a hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, each hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;

instructions for providing a plurality of software objects, each representative of a software device accessible to the computer, where each of the software objects is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device;

instructions for providing a plurality of configurations of the hardware object, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object;

instructions for displaying the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one of the plurality of configurations of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously;

instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations; and

instructions for communicating with the hardware device corresponding to the selected configuration using the selected configuration.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations,*

which is present in claim 59. As noted above in relation to claim 1, Johnson does not allow a user to select one configuration for a hardware object. Indeed, under the Examiner’s interpretation, Johnson “requires a plurality of configurations to be set in order to operate” (Advisory Action at page 2, lines 11-12).

Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 59. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

A. Claims 7, 8, 12-14, 34, 35, 38, 48, 49 and 52

Claims 7, 8, 12-14, 34, 35, 38, 48, 49 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0035008 to Fuller et al. (hereafter “Fuller”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. As previously discussed in connection with claim 1, Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest the above-quoted features of claim 1. Fuller discusses a system and method for querying message-based instruments automatically and/or graphically parsing the responses, and generating code that encapsulates the connection/communication with the instrument and the parsing of the response (Fuller at paragraph [0019]). Fuller does not provide *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, but rather allows the user to enter only one configuration at a time. Hence, no selection is made from among a plurality of configurations. For example, Fuller at [0024] describes how “code may also be generated to call and execute the saved configuration.” This step allows a user to recall a single configuration for

a device, and does not display more than one configuration simultaneously, which is present in claim 1.

Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 7, 8 and 12-14.

Claims 34, 35 and 38 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. As previously discussed, Johnson does not disclose or suggest *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment nor updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment.*

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. As in Johnson, Fuller describes a system in which a user enters a change to be applied to the hardware object or the software object at the interface, and then the hardware object or the software object is updated in response. (Fuller at paragraph [0021]). This is not the same as *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment nor updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment*, as required in claim 30. In fact, this is the opposite of what is recited in claim 30. In claim 30, the hardware or software object changes and the interface is updated in response. In Fuller, the user enters a change into the interface and the hardware device is updated in response to the change in the interface.

Thus Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 34, 35 and 38.

Claims 48, 49 and 52 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface* which is present in claim 44.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Fuller is silent as to the objects being accessible through both an array-based environment and a graphical interface.

Thus Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 48, 49 and 52.

B. Claims 9 and 10

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0001896 to Hsiung et al. (hereafter “Hsiung”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, which is present in claim 1.

Hsiung also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Hsiung discusses a technique for processing information or data over a network of computers.

Hsiung further discusses a system for monitoring and controlling a process, or both monitoring and controlling a process, [0007]. The system illustrated in Hsiung includes an input module for receiving a plurality of parameters from a process for manufacture of a substance or object. Hsiung is silent as to receiving any configurations, and hence does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*.

Thus Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 9 and 10.

C. Claim 15

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Fuller and Hsiung. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, which is present in claim 1.

As discussed above in II.A and II. B., Fuller and Hsiung each do not disclose or suggest this feature. Thus Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 15.

D. Claims 16-17, 27, 39, 40, 43, 53 and 54

Claims 16-17, 27, 39, 40, 43, 53 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0004670 to Schmit et al. (hereafter “Schmit”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Schmit discusses one or more measurement devices comprising a measurement hardware device, a virtual measurement device or other type of device. (Schmit at [0013]). Schmit further indicates that a graphical user interface presents a list of available devices and corresponding channels appropriate for the indicated measurement type, where each of the channels corresponds to a terminal of a corresponding device. (Schmit at [0016]). Schmit further indicates that if the selected measurement type were voltage, the devices listed may be those devices available to the system which are suitable for measuring a voltage. (Schmit at [0136]).

Claims 16, 17 and 27 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, which is present in claim 1.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Schmit does not allow for *a plurality of configurations* of a hardware object, and hence does not allow a user to select at most one configuration from among the plurality of configurations. (Schmit at [0013]). On the

contrary, Schmit states “the purpose [of the configuration tool architecture] is to present the user with the ability to configure exactly what their application does ... and then build a single task that encompasses all of this information.” (Schmit at [0240]). Schmit allows a user to specify a single configuration, and is not concerned with specifying a plurality of configurations, nor selecting a single configuration from among the plurality of configurations. Accordingly, Schmit does not disclose *receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations.*

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 16, 17 and 27.

Claims 39, 40 and 43 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment* nor *updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment*, which is present in claim 30.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. As in Johnson and Fuller, Schmit describes a system in which a user enters a change to be applied to the hardware object or the software object at the interface, and then the hardware object or the software object is updated in response. (Fuller at [0013]). This is not the same as *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment* nor *updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment*. In claim 30, the hardware or software object changes and the interface is updated in response. In Schmit, the user enters a change into the interface and the hardware device is updated in response to the change in the interface.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 39, 40 and 43.

Claims 53 and 54 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface*, which is present in claim 44.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Schmit is not concerned with allowing the objects to be accessible through an array-based environment. Accordingly, Schmit does not disclose *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface*, as recited in claim 44.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 53 and 54.

E. Claims 18-24, 26, 41, 42 and 55

Claims 18-24, 26, 41, 42 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Hsiung, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0056018 to Pike et al. (hereafter “Pike”).

Claims 18-24 and 26 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, which are present in claim 1.

Pike also does not disclose or suggest this feature. In particular, Pike does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*.

Pike discusses receiving a first creation command from a user interface and establishing a communication channel linking the command interpreter and the control instrument independent of the interface bus or interface hardware driver type. (Pike at [0004]). Pike

indicates a GUI that displays information regarding the configuration of the various communication channels the user may establish in response to user commands. (Pike at [0036]).

In contrast to claim 1, Pike states “the GUI 14 displays information regarding the configuration of the various communication channels the user 30 may establish in response to user commands” (Pike at [0036]). This indicates that Pike displays a single configuration for each hardware or software device, and not a plurality of configurations. Accordingly, Pike does not allow a user to make a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations, which is present in claim 1.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 18-24 and 26.

Claims 41 and 42 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment* nor *updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment*, which are present in claim 30.

Pike also does not disclose or suggest these features. Pike describes communicating with a device in order to configure it. (Pike at [0027]). Pike describes that the user enters configuration data and then communicates back and forth with the device in order to change the configuration of the device itself. Pike does not describe *providing a graphical interface that provides interaction with an array-based environment* nor *updating the graphical interface when the hardware object or the software object are changed in the array-based environment*.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 41 and 42.

Claim 55 depends from claim 44 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface*, which is present in claim 44.

Pike does not disclose or suggest this feature. Pike is silent as to interaction with both an array-based environment and a GUI, and hence does not disclose or suggest *wherein the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects are accessible through both the array-based environment and the graphical interface*

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 55.

F. Claim 29

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,986,653 to Phathayakorn et al. (hereafter “Phathayakorn”). Claim 29 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*, which is present in claim 1.

Phathayakorn discusses a method for signaling and acknowledging events associated with resource object organized in a foldable object tree displayed by a GUI. Phathayakorn further indicates that a foldable object tree allows a part of the tree to be folded into its parent object, (Col. 1, lines 55-60).

Phathayakorn also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Phathayakorn describes displaying data relating to signaling and acknowledging events associated with a resource object. (Phathayakorn at col. 1 lns. 55-60). Phathayakorn is concerned with the objects as they actually exist, not potential configurations that a user might want to select. Therefore, Phathayakorn does not disclose *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of one configuration from the plurality of configurations*.

Thus Phathayakorn and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Phathayakorn in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-104RCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: June 29, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Kevin J. Canning/
Kevin J. Canning
Registration No.: 35,470
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

-